BS

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,822	12/27/2001	Jose Remacle	VANM160.001CP1	2468

20995 7590 11/23/2004

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER	
SISSON, BRADLEY L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1634	

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/035,822	REMACLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bradley L. Sisson	1634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 August 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-87* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-44* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *45-87* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/582,817.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *08/30/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 85 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 85 depends from claim 44, which is drawn to a non-elected invention. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 45-87 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Attention is directed to the decision in *University of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.* 68 USPQ2D 1424 (Fed. Cir. 2004) at 1428:

> To satisfy the written-description requirement, the specification must describe every element of the claimed invention in sufficient detail so that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the inventor possessed the claimed invention at the time of filing. Vas-Cath, 935 F.3d at 1563; see also Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572 [41 USPQ2d 1961] (Fed. Cir. 1997) (patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention"); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012 [10 USPQ2d 1614] (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("the description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed"). Thus, an applicant complies with the written-description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using

"such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." Lockwood, 107 F.3d at 1572.

4. Claims 45-87 are drawn to the following inventions:

- Claims 45-69 are drawn to a disc comprising registered data
- Claims 70-72 and 87 are drawn to a method of making a disc;
- Claims 73 and 86 are drawn to a kit;
- Claims 74-80 are drawn to a detection and/or reading device; and
- Claims 81-85 are drawn to a handling device for a disc.

With the exception of claim 85, *supra*, all claims under consideration depend from claim 45, the sole independent claim. For convenience, claim 45 is reproduced below.

45. **(Original)** A disc comprising registered data, and bound upon its surface, one or more non-cleavable capture molecule(s) which allow for binding with one or more target molecule(s) to be detected, identified and/or quantified.

The claimed disc has been construed as encompassing any and all manner of "register data," be it any literary work, known or yet to be written (in any language), any program in any computer code, any musical score, any data base, etc. The claimed disc has also been construed as encompassing any number of "non-cleavable capture molecule(s)," where the term "non-cleavable" is interpreted as being applicable to any concentration and/or formulation of acids, bases, visible and non-visible spectra of radiation, as well as enzymatic cleavage means.

A review of the disclosure finds the following examples:

Examples

Example 1: Detection of DNA on CD

Example 2: Detection of DNA on CD with laser detection

Example 3: Detection of protein on CD by light absorption

Example 4: Detection of protein Chips on CD with colorimeric labeling

Example 5: Detection of auto-immune antibodies on CD

Example 6: Magnetic detection of DNA or protein on CD

Example 7: Detection of several bacterial species and their genus by DNA microarrays present on the CDs

Bio-CD™ spotting

Example 8: Detection of gene expression on microarrays present on the CDs: exemple of HepatoChips

HepatoChips Design: Fifty-nine genes microarray

Example 9: Multiple sample analysis in the different molded chambers present on the same disc platform.

Example 10: Steps performed by the automate in the hybridization chamber.

Example 11: Olefinic oxidation

Example 12: Steps performed by the automate in the extraction, dilution, amplification and hybridization chamber.

Example 13: Target detection trough the reflective layer of a CD with one laser illumination beam and two detectors

Example 14: Description of a fluorescent reading device

Example 15: Detection of protein upon the disc according to the invention with colorimeric labeling

Example 16 : Detection of auto-immune antibodies upon the disc according to the invention

5. The examples provided, however, fail to provide an adequate written description of the full genus of discs claimed. Furthermore, it is noted that none of the "capture molecules" are impervious to any and all forms of cleavage.

6. While Example 8 teaches of using the "Rat HepatoChips ™ (AAT, Namur, Belgium)," and page 61 describes the nucleic acids as being "single stranded DNA probes attached to the glass by a covalent link," and Table 2 defines the target molecule in terms of certain genes and how they are believed to function, such does not provide an adequate written description of the immobilized nucleic acids, as such again speaks to functional attributes, and not physical or chemical properties that would allow a skilled artisan to recognize one sequence as being encompassed, or not encompassed, by the claims. Further, the record does not support the position that applicant possessed the nucleotide sequence for any and all target molecules, which fairly encompass any nucleic acid sequence that correlates with intelligence, aging, as well as correlating with any disease of any etiology, for any and all life forms.

7. As seen in claim 67, "the alignment of capture molecules is converted into digital information selected from the group consisting of words, numbers, music, software and data bases." A review of the disclosure fails to find an adequate written description of said "words, numbers, music, software and data bases."

8. Claims 73 and 86 are drawn to a kit. In accordance with Claim 73, the kit is to comprise *inter alia*, "reactants allowing the binding between the target molecule and its capture molecule and possibly reactants allowing the detection of a signal which results from said binding." As noted above, defining a product in terms of how it is to function and not in terms of what it is does not constitute an adequate written description of same.

9. In accordance with Claim 72, the disc is to v coated with a "protective layer." Example 13, page 66 of the disclosure, teaches of the application of a "varnish." The "protective layer" and "varnish" are assumed to be one and the same. The specification does not provide an adequate written description of just what the "varnish"/"protective layer" is comprised of. A review of the disclosure fails to locate an adequate description of either of these elements. Accordingly, the specification has not been found to provide an adequate written description of the claimed invention.

10. Claims 74-80 are directed to a "detection and/or reading device," which in accordance with claim 75 is "a compact-disc reading device." Page 66, lines 24-26, teaches that "[t]he reader device is based on a commercially available CD writer (Fig. 12-13)" (emphasis added). Page 8, lines 6-7, states:

> Figures 11 to 14 show various types of Bio-CD reading devices.

A review of the disclosure fails to locate and adequate written description of the claimed "detection and/or reading device," including the software that is required for its operation. While the claimed invention may be "based on commercially available CD writer," the specification must provide an adequate written description of the invention in terms of what it is.

11. Claims 80-85 are drawn to a "handling device" (claims 80-84) as well as an "apparatus" (claim 85). Like the disc and reader above, a review of the disclosure fails to find an adequate written description of either the handling device or the apparatus.

12. It is noted that the claimed invention is to be used in a method whereby a quantification event is to take place. Neither the disc, reader, handling device or apparatus are defined in terms

of comprising any element or assembly of elements that will result in the quantitative determination of any nucleic acid

13. For the above reasons and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, claims 45-87 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Response to argument

At page 16, bridging to page 17 of the response received 30 August 2004, applicant's representative asserts that "Applicant have provided some exemplary sequences which could be bound to the disc inn the specification and have provided the meaning of the term nucleic acid, oligonucleotide etc. on page 7, lines 13-17."

The above argument has been fully considered and has not been found persuasive. It is noted with particularity that the claims are not limited to just DNA bound to a CD. Rather, the claimed disc fairly encompasses any and all manner of "capture molecule(s)," which for purposes of examination have been interpreted as encompassing any and all compounds and compositions that can bind any type of "target molecules." Indeed, in accordance with claim 46, which is construed as being further limiting of claim 45, the capture moieties and/or target molecules can indeed be "new macromolecules" yet to be developed. In support of this position, claim 46 is reproduced below.

> 46. **(Original)** The disc according to claim 45, wherein the non-cleavable capture molecules and/or the target molecules are selected from the group consisting of nucleotide sequences, antigens, antibodies, receptors, ligands of receptors, receptor and enzyme peptides, lipids, saccharides, haptens, fluorophores, chromophores, catalysts, and new macromolecules obtained by combinatorial chemistry, or a combination thereof.

A review of the disclosure a ell as applicant's response fails to locate an adequate description of the broad genus of capture moieties and target molecules that are to be bound to any disc.

14. At page 17, second paragraph, of the response applicant asserts "that one skilled in the art would know how to convert an output data (digital information, as electronic string of 1's and 0's) into any desired form be it words, numbers, notes, etc."

This argument has been fully considered and has not been found persuasive. Attention is directed to MPEP 2145.

> Attorney argument is not evidence unless it is an admission, in which case, an examiner may use the admission in making a rejection. See MPEP § 2129 and § 2144.03 for a discussion of admissions as prior art.
> The arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. In re Schulze, 346 F.2d 600, 602, 145 USPQ 716, 718 (CCPA 1965); In re Geisler, 116 F.3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("An assertion of what seems to follow from common experience is just attorney argument and not the kind of factual evidence that is required to rebut a prima facie case of obviousness."). See MPEP § 716.01(c) for examples of attorney statements which are not evidence and which must be supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration.

15. At page 17, third paragraph, applicant's representative asserts that specific components of a kit "are well known in the art, and therefore specific recitation of their ingredients is not necessary."

This argument has been fully considered and has not been found persuasive. Attention is directed to MPEP 2145.

> Attorney argument is not evidence unless it is an admission, in which case, an examiner may use the admission in making a rejection. See MPEP § 2129 and § 2144.03 for a discussion of admissions as prior art.
> The arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. In re Schulze, 346 F.2d 600, 602, 145 USPQ 716, 718 (CCPA 1965); In re Geisler, 116 F.3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("An assertion of what seems to follow from common experience is just attorney argument and not the kind of factual evidence that is required to rebut a prima facie case of obviousness."). See MPEP § 716.01(c) for examples of

attorney statements which are not evidence and which must be supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration.

16. It is further noted that the claims do not encompass just that which is known, but rather, fairly encompass kits to methods yet to be developed. Neither the originally filed disclosure, nor applicant's representative's argument point to how or where novel and unknown components are "well known in the art." As noted above, the claims encompass far more than just a disc and method of making same, but rather, encompass detection and/or diagnostic device as well as handling device for disc. Said devices are construed as encompassing means for diagnosing any disease in any organism as well as detecting chemical agents in a combat theatre, any antigen for any life form. Clearly, the specification does not provide a full, clear, and concise description of all areas of the tremendously broad genera encompassed by the various inventions now before the Office.

17. Page 17, last paragraph, of the response, applicant's representative again presents conclusory statements as to what is within the level of skill in the art, without providing evidence to support such a conclusion. Such arguments are not found persuasive towards the withdrawal of the rejection; see MPEP 2145.

18. Page 18, first paragraph; page 17, second paragraph, applicant's representative again presents conclusory statements as to what is within the level of skill in the art, without providing evidence to support such a conclusion. Such arguments are not found persuasive towards the withdrawal of the rejection; see MPEP 2145.

19. Claims 45-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. As set forth in *Enzo Biochem Inc., v. Calgene, Inc.* (CAFC, 1999) 52 USPQ2d at 1135, bridging to 1136:

> To be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without 'undue experimentation.' " *Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk, A/S*, 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (quoting *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Whether claims are sufficiently enabled by a disclosure in a specification is determined as of the date that the patent application was first filed, see *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1384, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986).... We have held that a patent specification complies with the statute even if a "reasonable" amount of routine experimentation is required in order to practice a claimed invention, but that such experimentation must not be "undue." See, *e.g.*, *Wands*, 858 F.2d at 736-37, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 ("Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation . . . However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.' ") (footnotes, citations, and internal quotation marks omitted). In *In re Wands*, we set forth a number of factors which a court may consider in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation. These factors were set forth as follows: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. *Id.* at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. We have also noted that all of the factors need not be reviewed when determining whether a disclosure is enabling. See *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co., Ltd.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1213, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (noting that the *Wands* factors "are illustrative, not mandatory. What is relevant depends on the facts.").

20. As set forth above, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of the claimed invention, including the nucleic acids that are to be immobilized to the surface of a disc. Said nucleic acids are an essential starting material to both the making and use of the claimed invention. Further, without the disc, the reader and handler cannot function. It is well

settled that one cannot enable that which they do not yet possess, and that one cannot enable an invention when the starting materials are not provided. The situation at hand is analogous to that in *Genentech v. Novo Nordisk A/S* 42 USPQ2d 1001. As set forth in the decision of the Court:

> " '[T]o be enabling, the specification of a patent must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.' *In re Wright* 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *see also Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharms. Co.*, 927 F. 2d 1200, 1212, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1026 (Fed Cir. 1991); *In re Fisher*, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) ('[T]he scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art.').
>
> *****
>
> "Patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable. *See Brenner v. Manson*, 383 U.S. 519, 536, 148 USPQ 689, 696 (1966) (starting, in context of the utility requirement, that 'a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion.') Tossing out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure. While every aspect of a generic claim certainly need not have been carried out by an inventor, or exemplified in the specification, reasonable detail must be provided in order to enable members of the public to understand and carry out the invention.
> "It is true . . . that a specification need not disclose what is well known in the art. *See, e.g., Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1385, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986). However, that general, oft-repeated statement is merely a rule of supplementation, not a substitute for a basic enabling disclosure. It means that the omission of minor details does not cause a specification to fail to meet the enablement requirement. <u>However, when there is no disclosure of any specific starting material or any of the conditions under which a process can be carried out, undue experimentation is required; there is a failure to meet the enablement requirement that cannot be rectified by asserting that all the disclosure related to the process is within the skill of the art.</u> It is the specification, not the knowledge of one skill in the art, that must supply the novel aspects of an invention in order to constitute adequate enablement. This specification provides only a starting point, a direction for further research. (Emphasis added)

21. For the above reasons, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, claims 45-87 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled by the disclosure.

Response to argument

22. Applicant's representative directs attention to Tables 2 and 3 and asserts "ALL nucleic acids share common chemical properties allowing them to be bound to the surface of a disc. Moreover, the specification provides examples of detecting of a specific DNA hybridized to target molecules on the disc (Examples 1 and 7)." (Emphasis in the original.)

23. The above argument has been fully considered and has not been found persuasive towards the withdrawal of the rejection. As an initial matter, the claimed methods and devices are not limited to DNA on a disc but rather, fairly encompass virtually any and all manner of capture moieties and target molecules, to the extent the claims are directed to a disc or method of making same. The claims, however, are not even limited to just these two groups, but are also directed to diagnostic kits, detection and/or reading devices, and a handling device for a disc. Applicant's representative's argument fails to address how the specification fully enables the making and use of these other devices, as well as enabling the full scope of the claimed method.

24. As noted above, it is applicant's representative's position that "ALL nucleic acids share common properties.". If such is the case, it stands to reason that nucleic acids that are used a "capture moieties" would also have the same property as being susceptible to cleavage, yet, as clearly seen in claim 45, the capture moiety is to be "non-cleavable." Neither the specification nor applicant's representative's arguments address how this limitation is fully supported by the disclosure.

25. For the above reasons, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, claims 45-87 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Double Patenting

26. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

27. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

28. Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

29. Claims 45-69 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 49 and 50 of copending

Application No. 09/582,817. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn to a disc.

30. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to argument

Acknowledgement is made of applicant's willingness to file a terminal disclaimer upon notification of allowable subject matter (response at page 19, last paragraph). Accordingly, with not terminal disclaimer having been filed, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

31. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

32. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley L. Sisson whose telephone number is (571) 272-0751. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Thursday.

34. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, W. Gary Jones can be reached on (571) 272-0745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

35. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bradley L. Sisson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1634

BLS
21 November 2004